

Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting

September 10th, 2013

ITEM SUMMARY

Description: Item #1, BZH #27875
1500 6th Street South

Currie Park Development, LLC has applied for a Demolition of Historic Resource application to allow for the demolition of a Gluek Brewing Tied House at 1500 6th St S.

Action: Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the Heritage Preservation Commission **denied** the demolition of the Gluek Brewing Tied House at 1500 6th St S., established interim protection; and directed the Planning Director to prepare or cause to be prepared a designation study.

Roll Call Vote: Aye: Hartnett, Hunter Weir, R. Mack, Stade, Vork.
Nay: Faucher, Haecker, Larsen, L. Mack
Absent: Lackovic

TRANSCRIPTION

Chair Larsen: I will open the public hearing let's start with the applicant first please.

Bob Kippers: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, appreciate your time in hearing this application, appreciate the time of course that Mr. Hanauer has spent....on reviewing the documents we've submitted and taking a good hard look at the information we've supplied. The ... couple of things I think I'd like to comment on....some of which Aaron has commented on but I'd like to just add to it so you get the extent of the effort that's been put into trying to....either preserve this building by moving it or....providing some other alternative, Aaron, I may need help with the sizing of things if you would please. I think also it's important to have some prospective of what is the proposed development, and it relates to I think it's important to have that prospective to understand what the implications would be if we attempted to....preserve or retain....the building. By the way for the record I'm Bob Kippers with Fine Associates 1916 IDS Center, Minneapolis.....and we did....it's obviously benefits to this project is we believe it provides affordable housing at work force level income and market rate, it's going to be about 50% each, which is an upgrade from what the current housing stock is in this particular area. It...is consistent with....transit only development, it's at a scale that....tries to optimize the use of transit which is obviously In the area in the way of two different stations one which is the cedar riverside station or the Hiawatha line now I believe called the blue line and the green line which is the central corridor which will be opening next year. It also takes existing vacant land which is partly vacant and partly used by surface parking, not a particularly efficient use of urban land in an area such as this where there's a major employment....basis, both the hospitals, the University of Minnesota as well as close proximity to downtown. When we were designing the project, one of the questions did arise as to whether we can retain this 1500 6th street building and we did take a look at this seriously.....you should be aware that the site is somewhat constrained....for reasons that a major telephone easement that bisects the site so we were somewhat limited in what we could do on what land we could build the first phase....and that was a constraint that we had to live with it just wasn't going away. A direct integration of the building into the development would has limited has limits obviously there is a floor level incompatibility that results this

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

is a building that has a 15 foot ceiling on the first floor and second floor modern construction wouldn't match up with that, the need to try and have eyes on the street where we would bring the housing out close to the street but yet you don't, you want the residential units 3 or 4 feet up. There's some and then the matching of the 2nd floor would not be....compatible with the matching up with the existing building that's assuming you went built right up to it. That's 1 alternative. The alternative to that concept design wise is to have sort-of a more free standing building and in a free standing building you then have to deal with the set-backs as required by code relative to fire safety and so forth. And it would be at the corner of this sketch you see here the prominent corner of this sketch is the location of the existing building. And I think it's fairly evident that if we took a chunk out of that corner maybe not overstating it by saying it would mutilate the design and the....cohesiveness of the of the building the new building. Obviously if we had....a....if we retain the building we'd have to make it ADA compliant and other things....there's...a great deal of other expense but just simply in a design standpoint it we could not find it compatible and sensible and feasible way to do it. So it wasn't that we ignored that and didn't want to do that I can show you one part....can get the zoom please Mr. Hanauer, thank you, I appreciate your assistance. You can see I think the... how if we did it as free standing the dark shaded area up in that upper left hand corner is the building the....the 1500 6th Street building the subject building and then the project was....right up to around it and that results in using losing 6....units per floor and that's a 6 story building residential....floors so obviously there's an economic impact....as well....made it unfeasible. The other....subject I just want to touch on

is the....ah result of the City Councils action wherein we were asked to relocate the building move the building we do own a property which Mr. Hanauer identified on his drawing and....we spent enormous amount of time and effort in going through an administrative site plan review with city staff it was approved....we had met with the....tenants who occupy the building which surrounds the site that Mr. Hanauer showed and they had no objection to our need for a temporary use of what is parking around which serving their, their operation but....the ah....owner of the property was not willing at all to grant us a temporary 3 weeks is what we needed to move the building on there and we needed to be able to move the transport beams off from under the building and that required us to cross that property. But....that was we received a letter from the attorney which I think has been in the record....and we met personally with the owner in an effort to see if there was some way could make it work and so forth but the bottom line was unquestionably it was unacceptable to them so we had to abandon that. But I would like to show you I think what I wanted to illustrate we had investigated a number of other alternative sites for moving it....the....in this graphic, the....proposed site by the city council is right here, and that would be obviously the closest to the existing location of the building and therefore presumably the most economical. Although even that was not really feasible in terms of the fi costs of it, but the other sites that we looked at were along Cedar Avenue and one across the tracks....from the....light rail....for various reasons these were not workable....down at this end we have a property where we needed, we own....we needed some additional small piece from Hennepin County which is part of kind of excess unused right-of-way but the county concluded that they really weren't willing to relinquish it because the light rail comes right across it at this point the new light rail the central corridor and....so we weren't able to make that work. This is the 420 Cedar Avenue that Mr. Hanauer referenced again the cost of this is probably a hundred thousand dollars more just in the move cost as opposed to this site....and then the next one was Dania hall site which is a vacant parcel that the city owns and....we were told and this was confirmed by the....ah the ward....council member that we really it didn't meet the uses did not meet the criteria neighborhood criteria for uses of that property not that they didn't want a building but this particular building was not going to serve the criteria that was established by the neighborhood for that site.

We also spoke with a private property owner, Peter Dodge and his daughter Susanna and explored with them, giving them the building and they have a at the corner of 6th and Cedar have a....property that they own it has an existing building and a portion of it is vacant. And it might fit there but....they looked into it....getting pricing for the move,....fixing up of the building....some concerns about

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

some of the structural issues that might arise as part of it but they said it's just totally infeasible it's not economically possible to move that and make it work....the rents in this neighborhood would not support the costs not even close they'd have to subsidize it almost forever. The jewel electric site down at this corner.... is....the difficulty there was the metropolitan council....would not permit....the temporary removal of the....transit lines the overhead transit lines that would need to move to get the building over there. So we pretty much ran into....one issue or another at almost every site....but we...did spend a long time and talked to allot of people about trying to accomplish it. I think the comments of the Dodges were that it was so unreasonably inexpensive or expensive to just get it into shape as a raw space it's not something they were willing to take a risk on. It's worth noting and I maybe we'd, I may have mentioned it before but if I didn't any move to other than the 1527 6th Street which is the site the council had suggested would require it wouldn't be true of the jewel electric site but the other cedar avenue sites would require removal of all of the street trees the mature street trees on...6th street....the building is tall and the process by which they move it and those trees are all for the most part hanging well over the....street their canopy so that was one thing we met with the....park board forester and reviewed what we could and couldn't do and their conclusion was that we'd have to cut em back so far just to get it through that they would require us to cut them down and just replace them. In a neighborhood that probably wants to keep as many mature trees as it can I think that we didn't that would be a major shortcoming of any of these alternative on cedar avenue. Obviously a very real and major issue....with trying to move it is, the cost and were talking about just the move to the closest site of being in excess of four hundred thousand maybe close to four hundred fifty thousand. To move to say the middle of the block on cedar is probably five hundred five hundred and twenty five hundred fifty thousand five hundred and fifty thousand. That's without making any improvements to the space which would be needed, it's not a the first floor is gutted the basement is of course is unfinished and the second floor while it has an apartment it....probably wouldn't be economically viable to have an apartment we'd probably try to make commercial use out of it in terms of it. But that cost if you put in the additional cost of doing the build-out you'd probably another two hundred and thirty thousand dollars so you're at somewhere in the range of the high six hundred thousand to seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars just to move the building and it just cannot sup there's no use, no commercial use or residential use that....can support that kind of expense for the size of the building its only 15 less than 1500 square feet usable on each floor and there's two floors. By the way the assessed value of the building is somewhere in the low three hundreds so....it's over twice the time value of the building as it sits. So I think what I am trying to emphasize is that we went through a detailed process....and as we did unfortunately became more and more aware of how difficult it was going to be to make it work....it's very...expensive and it really doesn't result in a viable use. We've come to the point where we have no reasonable or feasible alternative and....but to request approval of the demolition. We concur with the staff recommendation and we accept the stated conditions if you approve it. Thank you if you have any questions I'd be happy to try and answer them.

Chair Larsen: Okay before you step back let's, see if there's any questions from the commissioners at this time. Any questions from the commissioners at this time? Okay we might call you back.

Bob Kippers: Thank you, be happy to.

Chair Larsen: Alright is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against the application now is the time to step forward and... please state your name and address for the record.

Janet Curiel: Janet Curiel, 606 27th Avenue South, Minneapolis Minnesota 55454.....I'm an ESL teacher in the Brian Coyle Center....and I live nearby as well but not directly in the plaza.....and....I know that you don't want to hear as you said about the people that might want to have uses for the building....I will say that I spent a few hours I could have spent more time but I spent a few hours walking around the neighborhood and....talking with individuals asking their opinions because I can see where where not everybody is going to be in agreement with this.....I, I would estimate three to one that people did oppose the demolition of this building....just simply for number one because it is a historic building it's a

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

landmark, many people that I know knew the previous tenant that lived there for some time and before that I know as we know that it was a tied house so it has historic value in that way. It is actually I in my opinion a beautiful building....and it's certainly is in keeping with the other tied houses that are in the neighborhood. And I think that what is hard for people in our neighborhood to see, myself included but others as well that we see so many old things just being chopped down you know that's it, no more use for them and then all we have around us is what we would say is new buildings and their not even usually as attractive or as long lasting as one would hope.....a few years ago there was some kind of recommendation to make the riverside plaza an historic....designation in order for them to receive money to do some renovations and yet that building, those building were only in the 1970's and this building dates at least a hundred years old if I'm not mistaking so I guess that....the people that I spoke with by and large and I could have spoken to many more I brought a packet of letters as Aaron said and....petition....that people would like to with not have this building be demolished....I can appreciate the difficulties that they're describing I personally do believe that, that, there could be an answer to some of those issues if people put their heads together....I think it would be worth the money, costs the cost of it being moved, not that I personally have that money but I think there are people that do and I will say that....that we understand that that, every you know the every....um situation where people are building they are receiving money from the city, taxpayer money of one sort or the other, and so we would just request that for the people and the residents of this area that there would be that we would continue to try to find a way and a place to take this building.....and we that's it, I hope you would consider our request. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Great, thank you very much. Alright is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against this application please step forward. Hi, welcome, please state your name and address for the record for me... Your name and address for the record for me.

Sahro Abdi: My name is Sahro Abdi, my address is 1530 South 6th Street.

Chair Larsen: Okay, thank you.

Sahro Abdi: she's going to be talking in Somali and then I'm going to translate.

Chair Larsen: Okay, thank you.

Sahro Abdi: Hi everybody, good afternoon, (Somali language). **Interpreter:** Uh hi, her name is Sahro and....she has kids that live in the neighborhood and she lives in the neighborhood as well. (Somali language) **Interpreter:**she's saying....we want we don't want the building to be torn,....we have kids that live in the neighborhood and....we want them to you know make you know organization or a little youth group that can fit in that building. (Somali language) **Interpreter:** She wants to keep the building still and....make it history for our culture, Somali culture. (Somali language) **Interpreter:**yeah, that's all she wanted to say and....I want to say something to.

Chair Larsen: Please state your name and address for the record for me.

Mahad Hassan: Oh sorry, my name is Mahad Hassan and I live in 1615 South 4th Street, Minneapolis Minnesota 55454 and....I want to say that I'm a youth that lives in the cedar riverside....neighborhood and....I am saying it as well that we don't want it to....be demolished and....we want it you know build....ah more better you know more better places so our youth can come together instead of being out in the streets and you know....and make a better you community leadership for our youth and make some game rooms for them you know, places they can do homework you know, places they can hang out, cause....we really don't have any place and you know there's allot of youth that live in our neighborhood that need that, that...(Somali language)

Sahro Abdi: (Somali language) **Interpreter:**....parking issues she said there is nothing wrong with the parking issues we just want the building, that's all. That's it thank you.

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

Mahad Hasan: Thank you very much.

Chair Larsen: Thank you both. Okay is there anybody else, please step forward at this time. Please state your name and address for the record.

Abdullahi Sheikh: Yeah, my name is Abdullahi Sheikh I work at Brian Coyle Community Center,...I have I just came to know about the situation of...the building today, actually less than an hour ago and a knowing what I know now I think a (tape over) of close to 7000 people young kids are coming up, probably in the next 20 years I won't be there. But when you look around you see young guys who are coming who will be there who will be the future... Minnesotans... one is I also feel that....the developers, you know the efforts they've done....you know all they have said you know have put into consideration. I don't think one is there has been enough engagement as far as the community is concerned to understand the whole complex of the building, the historical purposes,...the many attempts or meetings you have had in the past. I think that is lacking. If they may have met some people I don't think they have met everybody or most of the people, that's a concern I want to raise.....if the building is demolished, or, let's say we agree that we demolish what comes up? Is there going to be another building, we already have....eighteen hundred, one thousand eight hundred forty-two units in that area. They are more buildings that are coming up as was shown. So how do we balance economic, social economic development with rising population....issues about youth coming up,...other services come....that, that, are likely to be needed in the future. I want us to give this whole thing the....dimension of what will happen in the next twenty years if we come up with buildings, we demolish one, we come up with another one.....by then I won't be there, many of us might not be there, but of course these young guys will be there. For me what I propose is....the historical context of the building is it's, it's, the benefit of all of us. I want also to acknowledge the fact that....they have made attempts, they have made allot of attempts to place the building somewhere else, there's money involved, there's time involved,...but even when I consider that, I also want us to look at if we cannot preserve this as a historical....building, what are we going to do if we demolish? Will the space be used to build other buildings? Already we have as I told you, you know....average the average families in the in most of the occupants have, have....you know six to ten family members, or close to you know....an average of about four to five kids. And they the so, I want us to look at twenty years to come. What are we doing? We're demolishing a building that's historical. Are we building, are we coming up with another building? I think what I would propose here is, can we have a conversation over this issue? Involve more community members and come up with a decision that is both favorable to the community and also....to....shaman? Is that the name? ... So I think that's what I would propose....knowing what I know now...I think we need more engagement, more discussionso that....we have an agreement on the whole thing, but my first preference will be preserve the place as a historical place, if not, than what is, what is up if we demolish? So let's think broadly, let's see the next twenty years down the road and....that's what I want to propose.

Chair Larsen: Great, thank you very much. Alright, is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against the application please step forward at this time. Please state your name and address for the record.

Mubashir Jeylani:....my name is Mubashir Jeylani, I live at 1615 South 4th Street, Minneapolis and I am here to speak against the demolition of these of this building right on 7th Street, the thing is right now there are many youth that live in the cedar riverside neighborhood. I live around thirteen years and I know that my neighborhood has a rich and culturally rich....history, there's been allot of history in the past in the in our community and right now with all these developments going on in our neighborhood as we know, there's when the new light, light rail opens up there's going to be its going to change rapidly you know there's going to be a central corridor, these new apartments are going to be built, and then the thing demolishing this building, it's going to lead to many other things it's the message behind demolishing this building that takes away the history you know we want there's a....immigrants in this neighborhood and it's good for us to know where we live and what like who used to be before us and that's what this building symbolizes the, the culture and history that was there before we are and by demolishing this building it might lead to many other things so before we yah know I see that they've tried to make

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

alternatives about moving the building and I know it's really costly and everything but then there's still the aspect about the history and the heritage of the community yah know is there really like a price tag on there? So I'm just hoping that....can lead more discussions and hopefully not demolish this building but find some other alternative way to meet the needs of the community and the Fine Associates, thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you, well said. Okay, is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against the application? Please step forward. All right, anyone else?

Abdullahi Hassan:I'm Abdullahi Hassan, I live at 1515 South 4th Street.

Chair Larsen: Maybe you can step up to the little more....yep that one, yep just a little closer, there you go.

Abdullahi Hassan: My name is Abdullahi Hassan, I live in 1515 South 4th Street.all my all my friends talked about the same thing. Youth, youth, youth....Of course youth is gonna be the next generation right? education is one of the things you always talk about. Education is always, always the first thing you always talk about. Well for one, we got this opportunity to get it. Cause not all of people have education. And for the ... this building....could be a symbol to us. We already have Brian Coyle, Brian Coyle is always one place we study at but it's not enough, because we have a large, large number of youth. And if we have the opportunity to get it, we might do something about it. That's all I got.

Chair Larsen: Okay great, thank you very much. All right, is there anybody else? Please step forward.

Cadillac Kolstad: Hello, thank you for the opportunity to....speak today. My name is Cadillac Kolstad, I reside at 1909 Elliot Avenue....I believe that's within a mile of the project. Anyhow....I there's an awful lot....of history already being generated just in discussion of, of this project it's the discussion is almost becoming a historical. But....the neighborhood is...well first of all....I think there's already been a great deal of discussion about the architectural significance of the building and the significance within the context of the Gluek brewery and I think there is all of information there that would....suggest it would be prudent to look at preservation of the building for the neighborhood. However, I think what's been overlooked is what's I see brought up today and I would like to follow-up on that is that it, it's part of the fabric of the neighborhood and it is a landmark in the neighborhood. It is ever since the light rail has been constructed it's one of the buildings people pass by as they enter the neighborhood....it provides a great deal of context for the other historical structures and it is considered a historic resource. the neighborhood is not just important historically because of brewing history but this neighborhood has a rich and vibrant living history that's evolving today....in addition to the liquor patrol limits and what that implied for the history of entertainment in the area....and the demolition of the gateway district which created....significant influx of entertainment in 1960 to the west bank....that's a huge part of our music and culture heritage. The theater that's gone on in the west bank is a huge part of the heritage for the city and the state....and now the....immigrants that are here I understand this is an important location to the Somali immigrants and I believe it's important to many Somali's all over the county, I could be mistaken but I've, I've heard that and so the neighborhood itself has an important fabric to our history and I looked on the heritage preservation site and I noticed that in addition to preserving architecture that one of the important missions of the HPC is to preserve history and historic districts and....I'm wondering if people and what people do isn't the very crux of history. this, I noticed in the testimony that the project would have no negative impacts on the history of the architecture surrounding it and that may be true, however the project has already had a negative impact on our living history, it has resulted in the expulsion of the bedlam theater from the neighborhood which was important to many people and which I considered my church. So....there's already been some, some negative impact so I'm skeptical that it won't. Now that being said, I'm not here to....chastise the developer I think the developer has done a good job of trying to relocate the building and even though many people were opposed even to the relocation....this seemed like a good compromise. Now the city, county and met council seem to be throwing up the road blocks

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

and I'm wondering if the city, county and the met council couldn't come up with something to help all of us to resolve this situation because clearly there's a lot of tension here between a lot of communities and the developer and....the city, the county and the met council could be doing a lot to....resolve this. I understand that it's not part of the purview of the, that we're just supposed to talk about the history of the building but we were presented with a lot of information both in the materials and today about the benefits of the project. And ... so....so we did hear about that but I'm wondering why that was being brought up today when we were supposed to be talking about specifically the history of the building....I'm not here to speak in favor or against building buildings but I think some very good points have been brought up that the neighborhood is becoming cluttered and that....we need to look at all developments very carefully....I reviewed the entire packet and....you know I think there's some really overlooked things, you know ten years ago when a lot of this research was done and the reports I think a lot of people had overlooked the importance of the west bank. But it seems obvious and clear to me that this neighborhood has a continuity, and has a history that is incredibly layered, it's incredibly layered. And I just want to review some of my notes I'm trying to keep it brief but it's not a brief subject and it's had, had a great deal of debate and I appreciate your, your time. I think you know and it does present an opportunity to maintain a living history and to help build community as a musician and entertainer one of the things I do is help to reinterpret history to bring to bring context to our present day and another thing I do is to build community through the music and I think that....this is an example where we could do both. I'd also like to note that while we were looking at spending a great deal of public money to subsidize this project the city of Saint Paul spent a bunch of money to bring the Bedlam Theater over to Saint Paul because they realized what a cultural asset this was and....it may not be historic in Saint Paul but they still realized the significance of the culture. So,....you know there's a lot of discussion as to whether or not this belongs on the national register of historic places but I'm here to say this is important locally, this is important to the people who live in this community and even people who no longer live in the community who spent time there who do reside in Hennepin County or in the metropolitan area or the state at large. This is also one of the oldest settled areas of Minneapolis on the west side of the river with settlement dating back to within a year of opening up the border by opening up settlement by the government and so I would encourage....look at preservation because of that history....the claim that preservation will negatively affect the harmonious growth of our urban community is ridiculous....the, the density provided....up until 1950 in Minneapolis was double the population density we have today and many people considered it to be a vibrant and harmonious community with the historic buildings that were present. This is the only part of the liquor patrol limits in that old Minneapolis that still retains that flavor and character and I think I would like to take this opportunity today to encourage a more of the discussion I saw at the previous meeting, I can't remember the date but in the last discussion of this where there was discussion that there is history here and it does merit looking at the importance of preserving the fabric of the community....because of our local heritage and I've heard a lot of discussion about this part that reusing this building is not financially feasible but it looks to me from everything I've read that this entire project is not financially feasible without significant public investment. If we're going to make public investment my feeling and the feeling of eighty percent of the people I have spoken with and as an entertainer I have an opportunity to speak with many, many people is that if there particularly with the significant public investment here that preservation is an essential and the public really I think demands it. So oh that the, the....there are huge parcels of land owned and controlled by the city, there's a planned redevelopment of a parcel adjacent to the Sherman site called Lot A that they're looking at doing something with, perhaps the city could find a little space there. The mural on the side of the building was discussed but none of the history of that but this mural is important to the history of a lot of us in the neighborhood a lot of people have witnessed and viewed that mural for many years and it's particularly relevant to the music and cultural and performance art history of the neighborhood and it's in my opinion a beautiful mural, something that's been important in my life as long as I can remember. In fact most of my earliest memories are of that neighborhood. The building is complimentary to many of the other buildings and it, it seems like they can be widdled away at one by one. So in conclusion this is the oldest part of town settled west of the river not only is the Gluek Brewery history and the architectural history significant but there's significant history tied to the music arts and culture of the neighborhood and it's important

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

because it's part of the fabric of the community and removing this building will be like leaving another moth hole in a silk sheet. demolition has already been denied by the city and most people thought it was going to be moved we thought this was a compromise I'm not really even sure what I'm doing here....this also provides context for the historic cedar square west because having these small buildings around it shows how a giant 42 story skyscraper complex was plopped down in the middle of a Victorian neighborhood. Moving buildings in Minneapolis is part of our history we have a long standing history there's been buildings moved from cedar riverside to improve other historic districts and there's been buildings moved previously by horse and carriage to the seward neighborhood because at the time it was more economically feasible then building a new buildingand that's why many of the buildings in seward actually predate the age of the buildings in the west bank because they are the old buildings from the west bank. So in conclusion I would ask that you continue with your good decision previously to deny this application and to encourage the city and the county and the met council to step up and aid the developer if the city indeed really wants this project to happen then the city should step up and do something to help save the building. If a financing package similar to what the developer is expecting was presented to somebody to move the building I'm sure you would have people lining up. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. There's no clapping. Thank you. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against this application please step forward at this time. All right, anybody else.

Bianca Fine: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am Bianca Fine with Fine Associates. I do not speak in favor or against this application but I want to clarify some points and perhaps one misconception. One thing that I want to clarify is the statement that we have....expelled the bedlam theater from the building that we own across the street at 5101 6th Street, that's a historic building that would qualify as a historic building by federal criteria which we intend to keep and to integrate in the final phases of our developments. We let the bedlam, the bedlam theater had been displaced at one point early on and we let to use that building for a nominal for symbolic amount for almost three years. But at that point, a new more pressing need of the neighborhood arise, arose that is the Daralquba Cultural Center had been evicted. And that is an important group that provides a number of services that are needed to the neighborhood which includes youth services....elderly services, assistance for woman and one thing you should know that the east African community includes allot of single woman who are

head of household which is a very tough thing to be. It also includes now a health common clinic that provides a variety of medical services. So we told the bedlam that their time had come they were supposed to use the building for one year and they used it for some three and a half years and it was now time for someone else to use it and Daralquba Center has been using it and it's a large building like twelve thousand square feet and they use every square foot of it for things which are really very good for the neighborhood. So this expulsion of bedlam was hardly predicated by heartlessness on the developer's part. With regard to....to the historical significance of the building I would like to reiterate the opinion of our historical conservator Charlene Royce that while it is true that it is a nice old building it makes sense that SHIPO has not considered it to....to be of historical significance because the outside has been somewhat altered, the context around it has been totally destroyed by the developments that occurred back in the fifties both around it and across 15th Avenue with the establishment of Currie Park and the freeway exchange and so on...and the inside has been completely gutted. Now I know that primarily you concern yourself with the preservation with the outside of the building but in this particular case this building is significant for could be significant for the function it carried out as a tied house. If you step into this building you have no idea that it could have been a tied house in the past because, because it has been completely gutted. Its reuse as it has been pointed out would represent an investment of between six hundred and seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars which means that per square foot you have a price of between two hundred and thirty-two and two hundred and seventy dollars per square feet, a square foot. Which is more than twice as much what is supportable, so there is no private....taker for this building.... one one thing that I keep hearing that there is allot of public contribution, certainly there is

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

some but there is also a major contribution to there will be a major contribution to the tune of five and a half million from the developer because there is at this time there is a gap of five and a half million that will have to be filled up and we have exhausted the public the public sources.

Chair Larsen: Can I ask a follow up question to that? Is the public source is that state, federal or local?

Bianca Fine: Yes.

Chair Larsen: All three?

Bianca Fine:....we do not have federal funds, there are no federal funds for this kind of development but we have...

Chair Larsen: State so state and local? Or just..

Bianca Fine: City, county and state.

Chair Larsen: City, county and state.

Bianca Fine: And we have spent some three years...trying to gather every possible penny and the city and CPED has been really really helpful but this is a very large project with allot of affordable units so it ends up having a large gap. And we are happy to fill it up but it cannot support any more stress. That's all I wanted to say, if you have any more question we'll be very happy to answer them.

Chair Larsen: Okay, thank you. All right is there anybody else that wishes to speak? Please step forward at this time. Okay you're welcome to step forward...Hi there please state your name and address for the record.

Guy Cornells: My name is Guy Cornells and I live at 1600 South 6th Street. I've lived on the west bank for the last 27 years...and it is a very diverse...I would say vibrant community and....being that we are so uniquely located so close to downtown within the two light rail lines, the universities of Augsburg, and the university of Minnesota, along with the hospitals and everything. I think the neighborhood would benefit from the increase of apartment units which would bring more people into the neighborhood which would benefit all of the local business so I am in favor of the Fine Associates project go forward, cause I believe it would benefit the neighborhood more in a....sustained you know substantial financial way then....and the one thing that is very consistent about the west bank is there's always change, and I know its change is difficult but... this is a unique area and change will always be a part of it and I think this is be a nice addition. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you, thank you for coming. All right is there anybody else that wishes to speak? Please step forward. All right, last one.

Hussain Ahmed: Hi Mr. Larsen my name is Hussain Ahmed I am the Director of West Bank Community Coalition, the official neighborhood organization for the cedar riverside west bank, I'm just here to make a quick correct correction about the funding sources, there is a federal funding also avail that has been put forward for the developer, I think she just forgot that, I just wanted to make that, from HUD, when you asked about the funding.

Chair Larsen: Ok...ok, all right, seeing, seeing nobody further we'll close the public hearing. So we'll close the public hearing and...ah commissioners so....Question from Commissioner Vork.

Commissioner Vork: I'm sorry, my question if for the developer is that ok at this time?

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

Chair Larsen: That is ok at this time.

Commissioner Vork: Ok,...either it was mentioned either by the developer or by staff previously that the property has been advertised continuously for moving during this period and I'm wondering how the property was advertised, to whom and also....how was the moving cost vetted?

Bob Kippers: Though we did not do a formal advertising but believe me there've been allot of people we did speak with both in the community... Jim Morrid of the Fine Associate staff spends allot of time in the community including both the west bank community coalition which is the neighborhood group generally more represented by residents as well as the a cedar riverside or the west bank business association and the word was put out there that if there's anybody interested that we would welcome it....beyond that area, we obviously deal with people various parts of the city and the movers themselves we asked the various people we were working with to get bids we asked them if they knew of any candidates, we've asked Charlene Rice who's connected with people who might have a more serious interest if they would know of anybody that would be interested in taking the building and working with it. I think our, while not advertised on the net or other things, that it had quite a bit of exposure. And one thing you have to remember is you can move that building only so far which isn't far.....it's a it can only be moved within that neighborhood and as we learned even in that neighborhood it's quite a challenge. I have a history going back there in the cedar riverside area we did move a house off of that site back in the seventies so I'm familiar with that process but....this one just isn't, isn't going to work. And if your aware of someone, happy to talk to them.

Chair Larsen: Can you answer our question about the....cost, cost of vetting cost for the moving.

Bob Kippers: Vetting the cost?

Chair Larsen: Yeah that was her question.

Bob Kippers: Meaning ah....the

Commissioner Vork: Meaning how many contractors did you ask to bid a move?

Bob Kippers: We asked all the possible movers,....two of them stopped doing moves of this size they would only do very small things they got rid of their equipment because they couldn't afford it in the depression, recession excuse me.....there really were essentially there were three, and the third one ended up the end not saying that he could really do it.....but we went out-state looking we went out-state and out of state looking for movers and....the numbers just weren't going to work-the best numbers we got were with people locally but they weren't great obviously. So we spent a good bit of time and as I say the ones that have good reputations in town still have good reputations but can't handle this size building anymore.

Chair Larsen: I believe those were in provided in the back of packet, ok all right, thank you. Sorry, the public hearing closed. Ok, other commissioners? What's your pleasure commissioner Hunter-Weir?

Commissioner Hunter-Weir: I've been thinking about this one long and hard um... and in particular thinking about our role my role in this whole thing. And I was kind of struck by many of the plause and logic in what I say in that hundred and fifty pages that we got. the arguments that the state doesn't think it's historic, the feds wouldn't think it's historic, were not the state were not the feds.....there're other people who have the joy or the burden however they chose to see it of doing that. so when it comes down to local history does it meet the criteria as a historic resource? I don't think we've heard anybody say it doesn't in some fashion or another we might quibble about which criterion....whether it's social history which is what I believe or architecture which I can certainly see....but would by my first choice. I think that the liquor patrol limits was the critical piece right from the very beginning. And I think that there was support for this the city council and zoning and planning upheld our original decision....so that was that. I also had some difficulty with the with the notion that um...pointing to one saloon designed

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

by the same architects is tantamount to saving them all or that if we save this one we therefore have to save them all and I would argue that you can save different buildings by the same architect for entirely different reasons. And I would argue that social history is the reason for this one. The argument was made that demolishing this building will not affect....others but there is kiddy corner another property which is currently owned by people I would take at their word on that but as somebody else pointed out, times change. And someone else, that building could wind up the property of someone else and we've sort of entered we've started down the slippery slope on that one,....when they say the context is gone....I see a certain irony in that when we're considering the demolition of yet another building. So when all is said and done um...the question that comes down to me is...it economically viable and I'm not a hundred percent certain whether that means economically viable for the building, economically viable for developers who might see that building who might see that building in their path. but I guess my question is do we have a responsibility to make their development profitable or is our first responsibility to the building that nobody has yet said is not a historic resource....and unless somebody persuades me otherwise I would vote against the staff recommendation to approve a demolition.

Chair Larsen: So that brings up a good a good point. I think it's important to recognize Commissioner Hunter-Weir mentioned that there are that we have voted on this matter in the past and that we did indicate that it was that we felt was a....had some potential historic significance and...that was....overturned by the city council and which approved the demolition subject to the moving to the....to this other site. And so in that sense ...you know our...question today becomes are there reasonable alternatives to....to demolition have they have they met that standard....and....in terms of their um... in terms of the statute. And... so one of those being the, the significance the integrity the economic value....and its current use cost of renovation and feasible alternative uses so...

Commissioner Hunter-Weir: Even it could hmm thank you I forgot what my recommendation was going to be or my suggestion. I do believe that the developers have explored a number of opportunities to move this building. I'm still not persuaded that something that could not be done to incorporate this building into the new development site. The arguments have been well you know the ceilings are different heights and the floors don't match and so forth but the saloon is there and the others are on paper and I think it strikes me there's an opportunity for some clever person....to figure out how to make that work. So I guess that would be what I consider to be a reasonable alternative.

Chair Larsen: Ok, other commissioners? Commissioner Stade.

Commissioner Stade: I wanted to start out talking about the history part the liquor patrol limits the tied house that's important. But I think we also need to mention that this was a musical venue for quite amount quite a few years and....there's a couple books about the local musical history called joined at the hip it's a jazz history there's a west bank boogie another history of local history that talk about it as a sort of ground zero for the jazz a vanguard movement of the nineteen seventies the rainbow gallery, when it was the rainbow gallery. And....I think that's something to consider that's quite important if somebody could tell us if Bob Dylan played there when he was in west bank I think that would be helpful but I don't know if that's true or not.I think about Florence court is....a building that did do new construction and they....incorporated the old building which I know was like falling apart so....this seems allot more solid and I think with some creativity it could be incorporated and if you don't want to be creative you could move that courtyard that's in the plans and have that surround the building. So I would definitely vote against the recommendation of staff.

Chair Larsen: Okay commissioners, other commissioners? Commissioner Linda Mack.

Commission L. Mack: While this has been a fascinating discussion....allot of which doesn't have anything unfortunately to do with our decision....you know the needs of the community are compelling....I can't help but think about Dania hall and....how that was a community center and how sad it was when it was in the process of the renovation and....and burned down and hasn't been replaced. There's clearly a

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

need for a community center that is not relevant to our decision today. as for the history of this particular Gluek tied house I just keep coming back to the map that shows the number of Gluek tied houses that are around the city....I think perhaps all or most of them being used as bars their original use and feel that that adequately conveys the history of this building type and....that to focus on the one that has been....remodeled and both inside and out is no longer in that use and....actually puts so much attention on it and even think about....putting so much money into preserving it I actually....find....very disturbing I just think its preservation gone wild. I'm probably not gonna get allot of support for my position by making this statement but I think the developers have made an extraordinary effort to find a place to move this, it's extremely to move, it is extremely expensive to renovate it, when it is renovated it will not look like....you know it's hard to know what use it will serve....there's a need for, there's not, our-our view is not whats-what the lands being used for that's a that's a different matter so I'm not going to speak to that. I just think we need....some perspective here and kind of look at the big picture and I hope that the, the crying need of the community for....space for community needs is something that is pursued again that is not our job and I don't think this is a very viable building to serve that use and is certainly not a viable building to serve that use after the immense expense of moving it and renovating it so I would support the staff recommendation.

Chair Larsen: Alright other thoughts? All right I'll go. I agree that the conversation here today was....is important it's one of the few opportunities that sometimes the community has to air their concerns and questions raised regarding zoning, planning, future use....the neighborhood are important and unfortunately were not the venue to do that....it's a place to be heard but at the same time its' not in our purview and responsibility or rights to...to manage that process. You know zoning, planning,....and....you happen....happen in a different part of the city and were citizen were a citizen body....but I think at the same time you know if you step back that the that the plan that is in place in the future for the potential development on the site is part of the comprehensive plan to build more housing opportunities for the community and this is a private parcel of land so that the cry for a community center is certainly one that should be heard and there are city owned lots that you know potentially have the opportunity and the for that but....to ...be you know we don't have the ability to force a private owner to create space for a particular use. Nor do we expect you know if you own a home or in your apartment or house that you know that you're forced to invite others in and...to make way for something so that the ... idea that we would require a private owner to do something in particular to do something for a particular use....doesn't I think is misguided....I think when we look at the particular property and what we're here to look at....is...this building an old building that has had many uses over time and its primary use and reason for potential historic significance is based on its use as a Gluek tied brewing house....Gluek brewing tied house and I look at it in terms of then the context of other Gluek tied houses and...when I consider it with the other extent with the existing buildings....it to me it strikes more a matter of would this be a contributing property to a district that was made up of Gluek tied houses or would this be an individual landmark that stands up to the to the level of....of standing on its own as a shining example of what a Gluek brewing house....Gluek brewing tied house would be. And, I think that was the original intent of the of the designation....proposed designation and interim protection and given....I think commissioner Mack you know made....points well noted that where hot dishes currently located which has an extent interior and that was a Gluek tied brewing house the Monte Carlo restaurant....was also a Gluek brewing tied house and those are as well as there's some others identified nearby....along the light rail I think by the franklin avenue station if I'm not mistaken and....so there are other well preserved examples of what would I would consider sort of better....more potentially individual designatable landmarks....for-for that particular use. And....so when I consider, consider that I also consider the efforts that the developer has made....while it may not seem like allot but they've been at this for a year.....and... trying to....make the most of the property and to relocate it...and...., probably done more than I've seen many other developers do....certainly that have come before us. So I'm-I'm-I'm certainly disappointed I don't I don't take lightly the destruction of any....embodied energy or-or you know building that's there....but at the same time I think they have done....their due diligence in trying to relocate the property and....so I would actually support the motion or the staff recommendation. Commissioner Faucher.

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

Commissioner Faucher:....I would agree with-with what you've said I this is it's a difficult one but I, I think the developer has done what we asked them to do and unfortunately it hasn't hasn't worked out. I also do think it's important that we hear from the public and how they feel about the building and that there is a potential use however that has not all come together and I would urge you and it sounds like there's great need in your neighborhood for, for a youth center and....I'm actually a little disappointed that the council member for the ward is not here tonight....or I don't know if anyone has spoken to them but I would urge you to contact your council member....and look at other ways of going about that. But I find myself in kind of an odd position because I'm going to make a motion that we because I don't often do this that we adopt staff findings and approve the demolition of... (End of tape one)

Chair Larsen: Ok, any further discussion further discussion on the motion? Ok seeing none we'll call the role.

Roll Call:

Aye: Faucher, Haeker, Larsen, L. Mack.

Nay: Hartnett, Hunter-Weir, R. Mack, Stade, Vork.

Absent: Lackovic

Motion Fails

Chair Larsen: Ok, that motion fails. Alright, further discussion? Commissioner Haeker.

Commissioner Haeker: I mean there's the whole reason I'm sitting up here is because I love old buildings and saw half of them all get torn down for you know development....but with this one I mean it just it just doesn't meet the level of you know even Minneapolis landmark status in my mind it's it's been destroyed it's been you know totally you know neglected, the fabric around its been torn down which you know isn't necessarily an argument because why was all that torn down....but it just you know....it you know we can't preserve everything not that that's an argument but that you know we just I think we need to look at....you know what our you know what our purview is up here and the ordinances and statutes that were supposed to adhere to and I think a fine arguments been made to demonstrate that it just doesn't have the integrity to meet landmark status and....ah that you know it just its....it's just one of those ones that falls in that category of.... needing to be demolished because it's private property and....and I made this argument before and it doesn't have anything to do with our purview but there's a whole argument of embodied energy and you know there's allot ofyou know other things other than preservation with all the materials that are in this building and other buildings that you know that if we had some ordinances and statutes surrounding that-that there might be a more compelling argument but from at least from my prospective and our purview....as commissioners the heritage preservation commission I just don't see I holding the mustard to....not approve the demolition.

Chair Larsen: Ok, Commissioner Hartnett.

Hartnett: I think, I think for me the reason I voted no was-is not I-I think the building were an isolated....you know as it were an historic brew pub....in its self in an island in a sea of other kinds of buildings than I would say it's probably not worth saving although I will say as a person who spends my career looking at old masonry buildings it from the pictures I've seen....to me it's in remarkably good shape....at least the exterior and for masonry it's....it's you know the expense, major expense is really trying to trying to recreate or repair or renovate the....exterior the interior can be done in a number of different ways that I think can be somewhat less expensive so I'm not sure if I necessarily agree with the fact that it's in such rough shape. but more importantly than that you know it's a corner that had....a number of different bars....that were important to that....you know to the to the....to the portion of the history of Minneapolis where, where people would go and relax and drink a beer and there's a there really is a threat of the history there and I think if we lose one of these then maybe we lose the next one and the next one and it's gone and I think there's the potential for this area to turn into something that that embraces that history and...that....you know there can be new vibrancy for that that use in the area....you

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

know and I, I certainly respect and appreciate all the efforts that were put into....into trying to save it and, I agree that if it were on my dime I certainly wouldn't be spending the money it just doesn't make feasible sense but I think our job is....to preserve the heritage of the city I think there is a heritage there it's not just this building I think it's the buildings that surround it and the and the activities that that took place in the past and the activities that may continue in the future and I guess I'm not ready yet to vote for that to go away....and to give this building up yet.

Chair Larsen: I think it's important to consider and to remember that...when it comes to the demolition I sort of mentioned this early but that...there's a threshold...that...needs to be met in terms of determining whether and this is from the code here so In determining in whether reasonable alternative exist the commission shall consider but not be limited the significance of the property the integrity of the property and the economic value or usefulness of the existing structure including its current cost, current use, cost of renovation and feasible alternative uses. So that kind of goes both ways so Commissioner Hartnett to your point about the dollars in some ways it is our responsibility to... to consider the cost. So this isn't a public entity were not saying hey you know you've got all the money in the world and you should spend every last dime so that....threshold kind of goes both ways. So in that sense you were making the case that... there...that expense might be too much. And so is that a reasonable burden to place on them given the efforts that they've made to...consider alternatives. And I think our....city attorney has....wants to weigh in.

Erik Nilsson: Thank you Mr. Chair, Erik Nilsson, City Attorney, I advise the HPC. Just to clarify to frame your decision again I think we've been off course a bit...one this property is not individually designated, it's not within an historic district. The question before you is whether it's an historic resource or not. The applicant has asked for demolition, the standard to apply to a demolition decision and it's their burden of proof is whether there is, whether there are....whether they have proven that there are no reasonable alternatives to demolition. The code gives you guidance on determining what is reasonable? Cost, money, financial considerations are certainly part of a consideration of whether something is reasonable or feasible. Even if this were designated as historic they could still ask to demolish it and the standard is exactly the same. Whether they've proven and met their burden of proving that there are no reasonable alternatives to demolition. And so...that's really the question before you here today. Is whether they have met their burden of proving that there are no alternatives to demolition and in a macro sense, those alternatives would be to keep the building there and incorporate in the development in some fashion, move it, or demolish it. And...so I would say at the macro level though that should guide you decision and then you can determine based on the evidence that's been presented to you today...whether they have met that burden.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. All right, Commissioner Vork.

Commissioner Vork: Thank you. With respect to that particular point, I just want to say for my own decision I.... appreciate the steps that the developer has taken I'm a little concerned that the property was not placed on the internet as the developer indicated for other folks to weigh in on feasibility of moving....I can appreciate that the developer has a lot of experience and knows a lot of people...but I think I would have felt more comfortable had it appeared to me that this was very open process with opportunity for lots of folks to weigh in and determined whether or not some other party might be able to make a move work.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Hunter-Weir.

Commissioner Hunter-Weir: Yeah I think the two things we keep coming back to that....I guess I have a different perspective on. One is the notion of moving it...and I can, I believe it's pricey, that they've made a really good effort to try and make that happen but the part about incorporating it and I'm not saying incorporating it as a Somali youth center or anything else, it could be a foyer it could be I don't know transit station I don't know what because I'm not an architect. But I'm not fully convinced that that

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

has been explored in the depth that it could, also the idea of an individual landmark. When we talk about it rising to a level we keep coming back to the architecture of it. To me that's not the best case, it is a case and I think a good case could be made but I think the really compelling case is the social history of the building and we seem to not talk about that part a whole lot. We kind of keep drifting back to the architecture of it and I think it is more broadly the heritage of it and the heritage of the community and one of the things that particularly struck me today were members of the recent immigrant community stepping up in support of a building that clearly was used by a different immigrant community of one hundred years ago and the history of the west bank is immigration, immigration, immigration different cultures, different languages and yes building will have different uses and needs but that's the beauty of the west bank and to me that's the part of the social history and why I think we should think about saving that building.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Faucher.

Commissioner Faucher: Just a quick response to that I think talking about the social history versus the architecture, yes even it's the social history important in evaluating the integrity of the building...the... alteration that has been made to it and its setting do impact that decision even if it was social history because if it's so significantly changed that it's not the same building as when the history of you know what its important socially for happened I think the integrity is still somewhat...suffered that's kind of why we talk about the architecture again but I understand what you're saying but just wanted to try and clarify that.

Commissioner Hunter-Weir: Just if I can respond, I mean the...real damage occurred in the nineteen seventies let's face it I mean that's what happened when the west bank looked a heck of allot more like that saloon than it does today. And as someone who lives in a neighborhood where we lost three hundred houses in the nineteen nineties the part that's very difficult for me is for people to say well jeepers, you don't have any old houses left therefore you have no history therefore we may as well knock that one down to because I mean how big of a deal can it be. And my argument is...were at the bottom of the slippery slope I am deeply concerned about some of the older buildings around because I think as the City Attorney just pointed out to us that fact that a building is designated doesn't mean it can't be torn down in the future if it meets....so yeah....somewhere I feel like you just have to plant a flag and say here it is.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Bob Mack.

Commissioner Bob Mack: Like most people I have been fairly conflicted on this one I think architecturally it really...a move to some place other than a corner because its design for a corner sort of doesn't really make sense. And I think that the social history piece as both Sue and Laura pointed out it keeps coming back to, well you can't really see the social history....but...and now I unfortunately lost my train of thought...by myself. But I think that I would agree with Sue that I would encourage thinking about trying to find a way to incorporate it. There's the claim that two-hundred fifty dollars a square foot is really high, as an architect I don't think that two-hundred fifty dollars a square foot is particularly high and so I don't think that it's exorbitant to think about putting that kind of money into the building. Having said that I would like to offer an alternative motion?

Chair Larsen: You have the floor.

Commissioner Bob Mack: I move that we do not approve the staff recommendation and we deny the demolition permit for the Gluek brewing tied house at 1500 6th Street South.

Chair Larsen: Ok, we have a motion on the floor, is there a second to the motion?

Commission Hunter-Weir: Second.

Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes
September 10th, 2013

Chair Larsen: Ok, commissioner Hunter-Weir seconds the motion. All right further discussion? Commission Linda Mack.

Commissioner Linda Mack: I would just like to speak against the idea of incorporating it into a new development. I think that is a bad way to preserve a building and a bad way to build new buildings. And the other thing I would like to point out is that the west bank community coalition that represents the neighborhood residents did support the demolition if the move didn't work out. As I read that document. So I'd just like to kind of put that in the record that there is a position by the neighborhood group.

Chair Larsen: Ok, is there other discussion on the motion? Ok, seeing none we'll call the roll.

Clerk: Laura Faucher?

Chair Larsen: If you can hold for a moment please...Commissioner Robert Mack.

Commissioner R. Mack: I move that we do not approve the staff recommend and that we deny the demolition permit for the Gluek brewing tied house at 1500 6th Street South.

Chair Larsen: Ok, we'll call the roll.

Roll Call:

Aye: Hartnett, Hunter-Weir, R. Mack, Stade, Vork.

Nay: Faucher, Haecker, Larsen, L. Mack.

Absent: Lackovic.

Chair Larsen: Ok, that motion carries. All right, there you have it, thank you very much.